



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,280	09/08/2003	Tatsuya Niimi	242548US2	7137
22850	7590	08/20/2007		
OBLOON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET				DOYE, JANIS L
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1756	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,280	NIIMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Janis L. Dote	1756

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see the attached, paragraph 1. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19 and 20.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see the attached, paragraph 2.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

Janis L. Dote
JANIS L. DOTE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500
1700

Art Unit: 1756

1. The proposed amendment filed on Aug. 6, 2007, after the final rejection, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or a new search. The proposed amendment to claim 1 requires that the light irradiator be a light irradiator, "which irradiates a write light having a resolution of 600 dpi or greater . . . with an exposure energy of 5 erg/cm²" and that the developer be a developer, "which feeds a developing agent to the latent electrostatic image within 200 msec after the surface of the . . . photoconductor was irradiated with the write light, thereby visualizing the latent electrostatic image to form a toner image." Claim 1 currently recites "a surface of the photoconductor exposed by the light irradiator is configured to reach a developer within 200 msec or less" and a light irradiator that "is configured to irradiate with an exposure energy of 5 erg/cm² or less . . . when the write light has a resolution of 600 dpi or greater" (emphasis added). (Claim 1 at the time the final office action was mailed on May 15, 2007.) According to applicants in the response filed on Aug. 6, 2007, "[i]n amended claim 1, it is clear that the resolution (600 dpi or greater) and the exposure energy (5 erg/cm² or less) of the write light and the time limit (200 msec) for the developer to feed a developing agent . . . are not mere parameters intended to be employed, but structural elements required for the claimed

Art Unit: 1756

electrophotographic apparatus." Thus, applicants appear to concede that the proposed-added structural elements in claim 1 were not present in the claims when the final rejection was mailed. In any event, the "clarifications" raise new issues because the apparatus would have to feed a developing agent within 200 msec from irradiation - a feature that was not required in the claims when the final rejection was mailed. As discussed above, claim 1 currently recites "a surface of the photoconductor exposed by the light irradiator is configured to reach a developer within 200 msec or less." The current claims have no requirement that the surface reach the developer within 200 msec or less of irradiation.

2. The examiner's refusal to enter the amendment filed on Aug. 6, 2007, after the final rejection, renders applicants' arguments regarding said amendment moot. Claims 1-18 stand rejected for the reasons discussed in the final rejection.